

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/804,332	03/19/2004	Thomas J. Smith	60680-1894	7014
10291 7	590 03/31/2006		EXAM	INER
•	HMAN & GRAUER I	PLLC	LOPEZ, F	RANK D
39533 WOOD SUITE 140	WARD AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	D HILLS, MI 48304-0	610	3745	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		e
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/804,332	SMITH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	F. Daniel Lopez	3745
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory in Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUN FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. Deriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>10 January 2006</u> .	
· <u> </u>	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for al	·	•
closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.l	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the applic	ation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit	hdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)] accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection t	o the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of:	reign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received in a	Application No
 Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B 	·	n received in this National Stage
* See the attached detailed Office action for	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	t received.

Attachment(s)

1)	\mathbf{Z}	Notice	of	References	Cited	(PT	O-892)	

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) 🔲	Interview Summary (PTO-413)
_	Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

Art Unit: 3745

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed January 10, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant argues that Sakata only deals with rotatable shafts; and therefore the teachings of Sakata would not be combined with Frame et al. Applicant is mistaken. Sakata indicates that fig 9 looks at a conventional piston ring (column 2 line 64-67). This indicates that the described invention is for a piston ring, and therefore the teachings of Sakata would be combined with Frame et al.

Applicant argues, since neither Sakata nor Frame et al teaches using PEEK as a coating, that there is no motivation to coat the piston ring of Frame et al. Frame et al teaches coating a portion of a piston ring with PTFE. Since Sakata teaches the equivalence of PEEK and PTFE, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the psiton seal art, to use PEEK as the coating instead of PTFE.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 12-14 line 2-3 "oxy-1,4-phenylene- oxy-1,4-phenylene- carbonyl1,4-phenylene" does not further limit claims 1, 6 and 10, respectively; since identically a polyaryletherketone polymer is oxy-1,4-phenylene- oxy-1,4-phenylene- carbonyl1,4-phenylene (see e.g. Grobe et al column 2 line 14-16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Frame et al in view of Sakata. Frame et al discloses an aluminum piston (12) in a steel cylinder having a piston ring (14) in a piston groove (18), wherein the piston ring has a thermal set resin coating (32) on a lower surface, wherein the thermal set resin includes PTFE; but does not disclose that the coating is a polyaryletherketone polymer.

Sakata teaches, for a piston ring including a synthetic resin, the equivalence of using either PTFE or PEEK (e.g. column 1 line 33-38) as part of a piston ring.

Art Unit: 3745

Since Frame et al discloses a piston ring with PTFE; and Sakata teaches the equivalence of using either PTFE or PEEK as part of a piston ring, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to replace the PTFE in the coating of Frame et al with PEEK, as taught by Sakata, as a matter of engineering expediency.

Since PEEK is the abbreviation for the polyaryletherketone polymer, which is defined by poly (oxy-1,4-phenylene- oxy-1,4-phenylene- carbonyl1,4-phenylene) (as disclosed by Grobe et al e.g. column 2 line 14-16), it meets the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Lopez whose telephone number is 571- 272-4821. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:15 AM -3:45 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Look, can be reached on 571-272-4820. The fax number for this group is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Help Desk, whose telephone number is 1-800-PTO-9199.

F. Daniel Lopez/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3745 March 30, 2006